

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 24 2007

III. REMARKS

1. Double Patenting. Claims 1-50 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/617,530. Applicant submits that the double patenting rejection is premature as the claims have not been finalized.

2. Double Patenting. Claims 1-50 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-58 of copending Application No. 10/617,526 in view of the referenced Chinese-English Dictionary Link. Applicant submits that the double patenting rejection is premature as the claims have not been finalized.

3. Claim rejections 35 USC 112.

In regard to claims 20 and 45, the rejection is moot in light of the amendment to the claims.

In regard to claims 26-50, the examiner rejected claims 26-50 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The examiner stated that the phrases "program product" and "computer-usable medium" were not defined in the specification. Applicant has amended the specification to add "[p]ersons skilled in the art are aware that a computer program such as DP 200, EWTP 300, BWTP 400, and/or AWP 500 can be embodied as a program product on a computer-usable medium such as a removable disk or a CD-ROM or as a download to a computer storage such as Memory 100."

4. Claim rejections 35 USC 101. The examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-19, 21-24, 26-31, 33-38, 40-44, and 46-49 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter because the claims do not result in a physical transformation or produce a tangible result. The examiner rejected claims 26-50 because of the phrase "wherein the computer usable medium comprises instructions." Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the 101 rejection.

5. Claim rejections 35 USC 102. The examiner rejected claims 15-19 and 40-44 as being anticipated by the Chinese English Dictionary. The web site referenced by the examiner does not provide a display in response to an activation of a single control as recited in each of the amended independent claims. Support for the amendment is found in the specification on page 21, lines 1-12. Specifically, "[a]fter the user has inserted a character or word into user input field 602, the user may click submit button 604" and "[s]ubmit button 604 instructs DP 200 to analyze the character in the user input field." Further support is found on page 21, lines 20-22. "When the user clicks submit button 604, DP 200 displays the Simplified Chinese characters 606, the Traditional Chinese characters 608, the properly accented Pin Yin word 610, and the English translation below user input field 602." Mandarintools, on the other hand requires several clicks, or the activation of several controls, before a result can be obtained. On page 1 of the Chinese-English Dictionary graphical user interface, Mandarintools requires entry of the search term and selection from menus in three additional windows before activating the "Look It UP!" button. The four windows are "Search," "as," "Output as," and "Look

for.” In contrast, applicant’s translation tool performs the task in one step with the identification of the input character type taking place automatically. Therefore, applicant’s claimed invention eliminates steps for the user and distinguishes over Mandarintools.


6. Claim rejections 35 USC 103.

a. The examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-13, 21-24, 26-31, 33-38, and 46-49 as being unpatentable over the Chinese English dictionary in view of Foolsworkshop.

b. The examiner rejected claims 20 and 45 as being unpatentable over Chinese English Dictionary in view of US 6,023,714 (Hill).

c. The examiner rejected claims 7, 14, 25, 32, 39, and 50 as being unpatentable over Chinese English Dictionary in view of Foolsworkshop, and further in view of US 6,023,714 (Hill).

Applicant submits that the amended claims overcome the 103 rejections for the same reason as set forth in distinguishing over Mandarintools.


Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2600
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-461-4050
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com